

Comments on Points Raised by Senator J. W. Fulbright in his
Letter of 31 March 1966 Concerning the George Carver Article
in FOREIGN AFFAIRS Magazine.

PREFACE:

Dr. George Carver met the editor of FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong) socially in the fall of 1964 through mutual friends. During a dinner table discussion, Dr. Carver developed some personal views on the social and political situation in Vietnam which Mr. Armstrong asked him to write up as an article for publication in the April 1965 issue of FOREIGN AFFAIRS. This article was published under the title "The Real Revolution in South Vietnam." In accordance with standard Agency practice Dr. Carver's article was reviewed for classified information before it was submitted to FOREIGN AFFAIRS for publication. Such reviews are conducted to insure that an article does not compromise or divulge intelligence sources and methods which by law the Director of Central Intelligence is responsible for protecting.

In December 1965 Mr. Armstrong again contacted Dr. Carver saying that FOREIGN AFFAIRS, as a public service, wanted to run an objective, factual, historical analysis of the Vietcong movement in the April 1966 issue, and personally asked Dr. Carver to write it. Again in this case Dr. Carver submitted his article to the Agency for the required security release, which was given.

Agency regulations permit employees to contribute articles for publication subject to security review. Over the years, a number of our employees have published articles. As has the academic world, we have found that skilled and scholarly analysts of the type so vital to Agency work find it important to preserve their credentials as scholars by writing and publishing in the field of their specialty.

QUESTIONS

1. "There was no indication of the fact of Carver's CIA employment in the magazine and it would be logical for the reader to assume, therefore, that Mr. Carver was writing for himself and not for the Administration."

COMMENT:

Dr. Carver wrote both articles in his private capacity and any assumption to this effect that a reader might make would be correct. Dr. Carver's association with the Agency is overt in nature and was known to some members of the press following the publication of his first article in April 1965. The same biographical data on Dr. Carver was used in both articles and caused no concern to those members of the press who were aware of his employment at the time of the 1965 publication. In the case of the article at issue, no attempt was made on inquiry to withhold or deny the fact of his employment, which was mentioned in at least one newspaper article commenting on his paper. This Agency was queried by the author of that article and Dr. Carver's employment

acknowledged.

2. "... was Mr. Carver encouraged by the Agency to write this article?"

COMMENT:

Dr. Carver was not encouraged by the Agency to write this article. In fact, the impetus for writing both articles came directly from FOREIGN AFFAIRS, whose editor on his own initiative asked Dr. Carver -- as one of the leading scholars in the United States on Vietnam, not as a Government official -- to write them. In both cases the Agency took the prudent and legally required step of insuring that the articles contained no classified information.

3. "Did Mr. Carver use information available to him only by reason of his employment?"

COMMENT:

A scholar employed by the Agency writing privately for publication obviously can and does use information gained from his employment as background and guidance for other purposes. There is no acceptable way of erasing from a healthy mind what it has learned except by the mind's own forgetfulness. If the classified information gained by the employee is important -- and unique -- his mind will be all the more tenacious in retaining it for further use, if only in consultation with himself. Going to the immediate question, Dr. Carver in various official capacities has been concerned with Vietnam since the summer of 1957. It is obviously impossible to determine exactly what part of his total

background knowledge is attributable solely to his official duties. However, Dr. Carver cited no classified or privileged information in his writing and a preponderance of the material used by him would be available to any serious scholar with Dr. Carver's background and the will to spend an extended period of time in Vietnam. As noted in the earlier portion of this paragraph, it is impossible to prevent classified information held in the mind from affecting judgments expressed, and to this extent it is probable that some of the material in the articles may have resulted solely by reason of the nature of Dr. Carver's employment.

4. "Did the Agency approve the article?"

COMMENT:

This question in essence has already been answered. The Agency posed no objection to publication of the article from a security standpoint after determining that it contained no classified information. The Agency did not approve or officially endorse either of Dr. Carver's articles from the standpoint of content. Neither article was necessarily an expression of Agency views nor did either necessarily represent a consensus of Agency experts in this field.

5. "Would the Agency have approved the article if it had been critical of Administration policy?"

COMMENT:

This is a difficult question for any executive Agency of the Government, and answers would have to be modified as we move through the spectrum of

subject matter from straight scientific experimentation to pure political articles. Each article considered would have to be judged on its own merits, using a basic guideline of avoiding discredit to the Agency by laying it open to the accusation of waging political warfare over issues of United States policy. In the case at issue, the article was considered to be essentially a factual, historical analysis. Any historical article may have political overtones but the main thrust of this one appears to us to be historical. Certainly a pure political article which explicitly supports or criticizes Administration policy would be discouraged. Any Agency of the Executive Branch would probably make some sort of remonstrance with one of its employees, identified as such, who wrote such an article entirely on his own.

6. "Would Mr. Carver have been free to write a critical article for publication?"

COMMENT:

This question has been answered in the comment to question 5.

7. "Why was Mr. Carver's official connection with the Government not made public?"

COMMENT:

The question of whether or not to publish the official connection with the Agency poses a dilemma which has often been considered in the past. If the connection is not published, there is always the danger of creating a furor from

subsequent identification. If the employee is identified, there is equal danger, in spite of any caveats which may be stated in the article, that the Agency will be accused of using this means to publicly promote its own views or those of the Administration. There is an additional danger that readers may believe, despite any caveats, that the author has had access to information not generally available and that therefore the article should carry more weight than would otherwise be given it. In a poll of those few Agency employees who write for publication, approximately 50 per cent had no preference as to whether they be identified as Agency employees. Of the remainder, about 15 per cent would prefer identification and the remaining 35 per cent were very much opposed. Those opposed based their position on the fact that they must travel to various parts of the world to engage in basic research. Although in most instances their connection with the Agency is known to host governments who have no objection to their presence, wide publication of their employment would lay them open to attack by local Communist parties and the left press. Such attacks would make their work extremely difficult, and in many instances impossible. After considering the alternatives the Agency arrived at the position of asking its employees not to advertise the fact of their employment, but in the case of overt employees (such as Dr. Carver) to confirm their employment if specifically queried on this point.

8. "How many other Agency employees have written articles in their field of interest for publication in the U. S. without attribution?"

COMMENT:

In the 18-month period prior to March 1966 Agency employees gave 31 lectures related to Agency work, wrote 84 articles, and four books. However, these figures are misleading in arriving at the number of employees engaged in these activities as it is generally the same people who write or lecture. In the same period of time, 70 people presented material for lectures or articles for security review. However, since this is a private activity there is no follow-up by the Agency to determine how much of the material presented for security review is in fact used; our records, therefore, show only the number of requests for security review, not the number of those who actually publish or lecture. Subject matter ranges from articles and books on scientific and technical matters to economics and history; scientific and technical subjects constitute the highest percentage by far.

9. "How is this kind of activity related to the role of the Agency as an information gathering institution?"

COMMENT:

While the Agency does have collection responsibilities, its primary statutory duty is to correlate and evaluate intelligence relating to the national security and provide for the appropriate dissemination of such intelligence within the Government. Certainly the question of the distinction between an

historical treatment of a subject and a foreign policy statement or position which takes into consideration historical developments is subject to different determination by different individuals. We have heretofore found nothing inconsistent with the Agency's information gathering function and publication of personal articles by Agency employees having stature in their professional fields, even though at least a portion of the information involved might be acquired in some manner related to their work.

We have felt that if we are to continue to attract and retain able, intelligence officers who are essential to the work of this Agency, we must give them -- within the bounds of security limitations -- the same opportunities accorded other persons in private and Government life to publish articles related to their particular fields of professional competence. It is for this same reason that we have endeavored to distinguish between their official and personal views by not attaching to their personal publications the imprimatur of their official Agency relationship.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

6D 0109

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

25 May 1966

25X1

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. John S. Warner
7D 01

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

The attached paper represents a consensus of the views of the following:

George Carver

and Des
FitzGerald

Sherman Kent
Dr. Wheelon

25X1A

It was also submitted to
George McManus and
in draft, neither of them
had any comments.